

King County Local Food Initiative – Healthy Food Access Action Plan

Goal: Improve healthy, affordable food access for low-income communities

Long Term Outcomes: Monitor reductions in obesity, diabetes, heart disease and stroke

Introduction to Healthy Food Access Action Plan Section:

Food insecurity, hunger, obesity, and inequitable access to healthy, affordable food are complex problems. We recognize that poverty and structural inequities are leading drivers and that rising income inequality, high costs of housing, transportation and medical care, and a regressive tax structure are all leading drivers of poverty. Thus, our recommendations do not strictly address the problems of health, hunger, food insecurity, or inequitable access as problems of food or individual behavior change only- but intend to get at the deeper drivers including poverty, institutionalized racism, and federal and other policies that support commodities rather than food for people. We see government (at all levels), for-profit businesses, non-profits, and communities as having key roles in reducing poverty and disparities, and ensuring not just food security, but that everyone has access to culturally appropriate, affordable, healthy, locally grown foods and has the right and ability to be involved in decision-making about their own food systems. There are already many medium-scale and small pilot projects in existence that are transformative and making an impact- but the problem is that they lack the amount of funds needed to have transformational impact. *Thus, we emphasize that the following set of strategies require a commitment to fund them in a sustainable, long-term manner.* We believe that to truly address inequitable access to healthy, affordable food, we must address poverty, the taxation structure, policies at all levels that favor cheap food and commodities from large agribusiness rather than healthy, locally grown food from small-scale farms, land use patterns, community empowerment and the rights of people, and the social safety net.

Background on King County Local Food Initiative:

In June 2014, King County Executive Constantine launched a Local Food Initiative to address both access to healthy, affordable food and increasing King County's local food economy. In order to achieve these goals, a stakeholder advisory group, the "Kitchen Cabinet" was formed to develop an action plan for each goal. The Kitchen Cabinet consists of public and private partners committed to healthy, local food. The Kitchen Cabinet met regularly between June and November to create this action plan. The plan was also reviewed and vetted by many other partners, decision makers, coalitions, and advisory boards.

The plan is designed to be implemented over a ten year time period beginning January 2015 with multiple partners, organizations, and agencies. The strategies and actions listed will be refined over time to account for local and current context and needs. The action plan is organized by strategies that are currently happening, those that are current, yet with additional funds could be scaled for additional reach and impact, and new strategies. The strategies are also prioritized as high, medium, and low. It is intended that implementation will begin with the high priority

strategies and the medium/low strategies will be implemented later in the ten year time period. Some areas of this draft plan are highlighted in yellow; these indicate areas where we need additional information.

There are many opportunities with this plan to link to and leverage other initiatives. Once the plan is final, we will connect with other coalitions and seek opportunities for funding.

Key Definitions:

Healthy Food: A healthy food is a plant or animal product that provides essential nutrients and energy to sustain growth, health and life while satiating hunger. Healthy foods are usually fresh or minimally processed foods, naturally dense in nutrients, that when eaten in moderation and in combination with other foods, sustain growth, repair and maintain vital processes, promote longevity, reduce disease, and strengthen and maintain the body and its functions. Healthy foods do not contain ingredients that contribute to disease or impede recovery when consumed at normal levels.

Affordable Food: Affordability of food refers to the price of a particular food and the relative price of alternative or substitute foods. Affordability of food is impacted by the budget constraints faced by consumers, who must consider not only the prices of different foods to meet their food needs, but also the prices of other necessities (e.g., housing, clothing, and transportation). For some people, affordable means free food that is provided through public and non-profit meal and food programs. USDA provides guidance on national standards for nutritious diets at various costs levels—the Thrifty, Low-cost, Moderate-cost and Liberal Food Plans (Carlson et al., 2007a; Carlson et al., 2007b). Within each plan is a market basket of foods in quantities that reflect current dietary recommendations, food composition data, food prices, and actual consumption patterns. According to the Low-cost Food Plan, a family of four with two adults (age 19 to 50) and two children (ages 6 to 8 and 9 to 11) could consume a nutritious diet for \$175.60 per week (USDA, 2009). In addition to considering food prices, consumers also consider travel and time costs in deciding where to shop and what to buy. There are also monetary and time costs in preparing and serving food, as well as cleaning up. The time costs of these activities may affect consumer decisions about whether to shop for and prepare a home-cooked meal, buy products that require less preparation time, or eat a meal prepared by a restaurant (US Department of Agriculture, 2009).

Equity: All people have full and equal access to opportunities that enable them to attain their full potential.

Food Security: The access by all people at all times to enough food for an active, healthy life.

Food system determinant of equity: Food systems that support local food production and provide access to affordable, healthy, and culturally appropriate foods for all people.

Inequity: Differences in well-being that disadvantage one individual or group in favor of another. These differences are systematic, patterned and unfair and can be changed. Inequities are not random; they are caused by past and current decisions, systems of power and privilege, policies and the implementation of those policies.

Targets:

This action plan is aimed at two broad targets (1) to increase fruit and vegetable consumption and (2) reduce food insecurity among King County's most vulnerable community members; those with incomes too low to meet all of their basic needs.

Only 12% of all King County adults and 26% of King County middle and high school age youth consume recommended levels of fruits and vegetables, and there are significant disparities (BRFSS, 2011 and 2013, HYS). Currently in King County, rates of fruit and vegetable consumption correlate closely to race and income, and we have communities with less healthy food access, less healthy eating, and coincident diseases. Eating fruits and vegetables lowers the risk of developing many chronic diseases, provides important nutrients for the human body, and can also help with weight management. Creating greater access to quality and affordable fruits and vegetables is an important step to increasing consumption.

Food security is defined as "the access by all people at all times to enough food for an active, healthy life." Food insecurity refers to "limited or uncertain availability of nutritionally adequate and safe foods or limited or uncertain ability to acquire acceptable foods in socially acceptable ways." (U.S. Dept. of Agriculture). In King County, 271,380 (14.0%) residents lacked access to enough food for an active, healthy life in 2012 and 79,320 (19.2%) King County children lived in food-insecure households (Feeding America, Map the Meal Gap). People in lower income households were more likely to run out of food than those in upper income households. Adults with less education were more likely to run out of food than those with more education. Adults without a high school degree were 10 times more likely to run out of food than college graduates. More than 1 in 3 people who were unable to work reported that household food often or sometimes did not last. Retirees were least likely to run out of food. The employed were more likely to run out of food than retirees, but less likely than the other groups. African Americans/Blacks and Hispanics/Latinos were more likely to run out of food than whites or Asians. Multiple race individuals were less likely to run out of food than Hispanics. Compared to East Region, more people in South Region said household food often or sometimes didn't last. All other regions were similar to each other and to King County overall.

Target 1: Increase consumption of fruits and vegetables among youth and adults; reduce disparities in fruit and vegetable consumption, with an emphasis on local fruits and vegetables. Increase youth (middle and high school age) fruit and vegetable consumption from 24% to 30%. Eliminate disparities in adult consumption, and raise overall consumption among adults from 12% to 20%.
Target 2: While we will strive for elimination of food insecurity in King County, our target by 2025 is to cut food insecurity from 14% to 10%.

Strategy 1: Increase the number of healthy food procurement policies in King County institutions (schools, child care, hospitals), with emphasis on institutions serving priority populations, in order to increase fruit and vegetable consumption at these institutions			
Rationale/Potential Impact: Schools, child care, and hospital settings provide opportunity for sustainable policies to increase healthy eating. These settings can also be prioritized to reach priority and vulnerable populations. As recommended by the Institute of Medicine, we will coordinate with partners to ensure that a variety of foods and beverages, including those recommended by the Dietary Guidelines for Americans, are sold or served at all times through the adoption of policies and best practices.			
Lead Organization: Public Health – Seattle & King County (PHSKC)	Priority: High	Type: Current & Scalable	Related Strategies: FA 2, 11, 14, 6
Measurement: Number of policies, BRFSS data (fruit and vegetable consumption), HYS data (fruit and vegetable consumption), Child care survey data, institution specific data		Key Partners: Schools, hospitals, child care providers, WSDA, Health Care Without Harm, UW	
Resources: PHSKC has some federal grant funding to support work in schools and childcare. Between 2015 and 2017, there are funds to support work with approximately 3 school districts and 20-30 licensed family home child care providers. PHSKC also convenes a healthy hospital workgroup. Possible resource in state legislation to implement a grant program to fund school kitchens.		Target Audience: School age children, early childhood, hospital workers, hospital visitors, hospital patients.	
Key Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">A. Provide training, technical assistance, and support to institutional settings regarding healthy eating best practices and policy development/implementation.B. Evaluate the feasibility of requiring policies in institutions via municipal, county or state laws.C. Identify and secure funding sources to increase the reach and scale of this work via grant funds and other funding mechanisms.D. Identify and secure funding for staff training, kitchen equipment for institutions.			
Strategy 2: Increase participation in school breakfast and lunch programs by implementing programs and policies such as breakfast after the bell in all schools, community eligibility, and engaging students, especially in schools with high rates of free/reduced lunch participation.			
Rationale/Potential Impact: Schools are a known and traditional environment for supporting the health and well-being of students. Children and teens spend up to half of their waking hours in school and may consume half of their daily calories there. Schools are in a unique position to support healthy behaviors for eating and physical activity. We also know that healthy, active students learn more and do better in school. 74% of students in King County do not eat the recommended 5 servings of fruits and vegetables daily. School is a major source of nutrition with 52% of South Seattle and South King County students qualifying for free/reduced price meals. Schools tell us they are seeing a decrease in participation in school meal programs. We will work with school districts evaluate reported decreases in school meal program participation so that we may target efforts to increase participation and obtain student input on ways to increase participation in the school breakfast and lunch programs, and make healthy food more attractive and available to students through strategies such as behavioral economics approaches in cafeteria and other school areas. School breakfast is currently significantly underutilized by students with only 44% of the students eating lunch also eating			

breakfast at school in Washington (ranked 39th in 2012).			
Lead Organization: PHSKC (with others)	Priority: High	Type: Current & Scalable	Related Strategies: FA 1, 14, 6
Measurement: HYS data, student participation in school breakfast and school lunch programs, number of eligible schools electing for Community Eligibility, percentage of students utilizing both breakfast and lunch programs		Key Partners: School districts, community organizations, government organizations, Children’s Alliance, United Way, PTA’s, students, school nutrition directors, UW (CPHN).	
Resources: PHSKC has some CDC funds between 2015 and 2017 to support this work in 2-3 King County school districts. Federal and state reimbursements for additional eligible meals.		Target Audience: Students, with emphasis on those eligible to participate in free and reduced school meal programs.	
Key Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">A. Provide technical assistance and support to all eligible schools to adopt Community Eligibility or Provision 2 to create universal school meal programsB. Provide technical assistance and support to implement breakfast after the bell serviceC. Improve the nutritional quality, variety and appeal of school breakfastsD. Monitor and provide input on state legislation around breakfast and lunch programsE. Engage students to identify ways to increase breakfast and lunch participation and implement recommendations.F. Provide technical assistance and support for purchasing kitchen equipmentG. Identify and secure new funding to enhance and build upon this work			
Strategy 3: Increase the number of King County farmers markets that accept SNAP and have nutrition incentive programs (“Fresh Bucks”), with a focus on south King County, and conduct outreach to SNAP recipients to promote utilization of these programs.			
Rationale/Potential Impact: For low-income populations, cost is a key barrier to eating recommended amounts of fruits and vegetables. Programs to increase access to farmers’ market for low-income people are recommended in multiple reports and resources. Nutrition incentive programs make fruits and vegetables more affordable by providing bonus dollars (the incentive) when SNAP benefits are used to buy fruits and vegetables. The City of Seattle Fresh Bucks program provides incentives worth up to \$10 per market visit to people using SNAP benefits at farmers markets. This means that when someone uses their SNAP benefits at a participating farmers market, they get extra dollars to spend on fruits and vegetables, making their benefits go further. There are currently zero farmers’ market incentive programs south of Seattle in South King County. Four existing markets in the area already accept EBT cards, a first step in setting up an incentive program for low income populations, with six markets without this capacity. There is also a need to promote these programs among SNAP recipients to increase use of the program and opportunities for increased fruit and vegetable consumption.			
Lead Organization: City of Seattle	Priority: High	Type: Current & Scalable	Related Strategies: FA 8, 13

Measurement: Number of markets that accept EBT, Number of markets that offer incentive programs, Number of SNAP recipients who utilize programs.		Key Partners: WSFMA, PHSKC, farmers markets, Department of Health, funding organizations, community partners, SNAP-Ed programs, SNAP recipients, UW CPHN.	
Resources: Current City of Seattle and philanthropy organization funding for markets and farm stands in Seattle, some PHSKC federal funds to support work in South King County. The State Department of Health, in partnership with the City of Seattle, is submitting a grant application to USDA in December, 2014. Additional funds are needed to grow and sustain this program.		Target Audience: SNAP recipients, farmers markets.	
Key Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">A. Coordinate with farmers’ markets to identify interest, barriers, and resources/support needed to accept EBT and implement incentive programs.B. Provide training, technical assistance and support to markets and SNAP recipients to ensure use and successful implementation.C. Identify a source of funding to support incentives (outreach, incentives, promotion, market costs)			
Strategy 4: Increase policies, practices, and incentives in local jurisdictions that promote access to healthy eating among priority populations through community engagement, comprehensive plans, urban agriculture policies, joint use agreements.			
Rationale/Potential Impact: Many King County communities have limited access to places offering healthy food choices and excessive and inequitable exposure to unhealthy food retail stores and restaurants. Healthy food system elements in city planning can increase access to healthy foods for all city residents. These elements include urban agriculture design and plans, local procurement systems, mobile and farmers’ markets and zoning in support of these, mobile processing units, farm-to-institutions food distribution, attracting grocery stores or improving grocery stores in lower-income neighborhoods, drinking water access, and policies and standards for food and beverages provided in city buildings and facilities.			
Lead Organization: Environmental Health Division of PHSKC		Priority: High	Type: Current & Scalable
Related Strategies: FA 5, 11			
Measurement: Population level BRFSS data, number of supportive policies, feedback from community members.		Key Partners: Cities, city planners, PSRC, King County, community based organizations	
Resources: PHSKC has some funds to support work with 3-4 cities between 2015 and 2017. Part of PSRC action plan, could do more with additional resources. PSRC model policies.		Target Audience: City residents	
Key Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">A. Implement community planning and other policy processes with cities to increase access to healthy food.B. Coordinate with jurisdictions to revise codes, implement urban agriculture and joint use policies in collaboration with community members.C. Provide technical assistance to local jurisdictions in taking a Health in All Planning Approach to planning and policymakingD. Include access to healthy, affordable foods in health impact assessments.			

E. Encourage jurisdictions to adopt “Right to Food for All People” policies			
Strategy 5: Increase the amount of fruits, vegetables, and other healthy food options available in food banks and meal programs.			
Rationale/Potential Impact: Visits to food banks and pantries is increasing in King County. This strategy aims to increase the healthy options available through these outlets for our most vulnerable community members. Through policies and partnerships, we can simultaneously address hunger and health for those who are most likely to become disease burdened.			
Lead Organization: ?	Priority: High	Type: Current & Scalable	Related Strategies: FA 13
Measurement: Amount of healthy foods procured by and available in food banks and food pantries. Data from WSDA Governor’s Goal 4 reporting.		Key Partners: Food Lifeline, Northwest Harvest, food pantries, WSDA, PHSKC, funding organizations, farmers, King County, Seattle Food Committee, South King County Food Coalition, Hopelink, Meals Partnership Coalition	
Resources:		Target Audience: Food bank participants	
Key Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">A. Increase cold storage and transportation options for food pantriesB. Provide funding to food banks and pantries to procure locally grown fruits, vegetables, and other healthy foods.C. Support food banks in promoting client selection of healthy foods.D. Pursue and identify policy solutions to ensure that the majority of food available through food banks and pantries is healthy, local, and affordable.			
Strategy 6: Increase summer meal participation rate.			
Rationale/Potential Impact: Good nutrition is essential for effective learning every day, all year long. Just as learning does not end when school lets out, neither does the need for good nutrition. Healthy children learn better, act better, and feel better. Summer meal programs help children get the nutrition they need to learn, play, and grow throughout the summer months when they are out of school.			
Lead Organization: United Way	Priority: High	Type: Current & Scalable	Related Strategies: FA 1,2,14
Measurement: Healthy Youth Survey data, data from school districts and individual programs.		Key Partners: School districts, PHSKC, YMCA, food banks/pantries, WSDA Farm to School, WithinReach	
Resources: Funding to districts from USDA.		Target Audience: School age children	
Key Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">A. Increase the number of sites in neighborhoods that qualify (i.e. by Census data or by catchment area of schools with 50+% free/reduced price enrollment)B. Increase the number of sites that serve meals 40 days or moreC. Improve the variety and nutritional quality and cultural appropriateness of meals served so kids return throughout summer			

D. Expand outreach and media efforts so families and providers know where to find sites			
Strategy 7: Identify and implement strategies with the restaurant sector to promote and increase fruit and vegetable consumption and other under-consumed nutrients.			
Rationale/Potential Impact: In today’s society, we increasingly obtain much of our caloric intake from eating out at restaurants with children consuming, on average, 25% of their daily calories at fast-food and other restaurants (USDA ERS). In some restaurants, portion sizes are increasing and the food served is not always nutritious. In 2012, only 3% of children’s restaurant meals at top 50 restaurants met nutrition standards (CSPI 2013). Especially in low income areas with high densities of “fast food”, many communities are seeking partnerships and policies with the restaurant sector to increase and promote healthy food and beverage options.			
Lead Organization: PHSKC	Priority: High	Type: New	Related Strategies: FA 3, 9
Measurement: Population level BRFSS data, HYS data, Number of new policies, Increase in healthy options offered.		Key Partners: University of Washington, restaurants, restaurant organizations, consumers	
Resources: PHSKC has some federal grant funds to pursue this work beginning in 2015.		Target Audience: Restaurants and consumers with emphasis on low income communities	
Key Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">A. Identify restaurants frequented in low income communities.B. Coordinate with restaurant partners (with emphasis on those serving low income consumers) to identify strategies to promote and serve more fruits and vegetables in restaurant meals.C. Provide technical assistance and support to restaurants to implement strategies (nutrient analysis, training)D. Pursue and identify policy solutions to ensure that the majority of food available through restaurant meals is healthy, local, and affordable.E. Fund and support innovative programs, such as subsidized healthy meals for all (Restaurantes Populares in Brazil)F. Promote/recognize restaurants that offer healthy, affordable options.			
Strategy 8: Implement policies to ensure an improved safety net for low income families to access healthy, affordable food.			
Rationale/Potential Impact: WIC and SNAP are important safety nets for low income families. However, there are families with income slightly above eligibility levels for federal programs that find it difficult to access healthy, affordable foods. This strategy aims to ensure that eligible families are enrolled in WIC and SNAP, and that new policies are pursued to improve access for those above current eligibility levels.			
Lead Organization: PHSKC	Priority: High	Type: Current	Related Strategies: FA 3
Measurement: Number of new enrollees, reduced food insecurity, fewer community members reporting barriers, such as cost, to healthy eating, improved policies.		Key Partners: DOH, family services agencies, WithinReach, health care providers, child care programs, food assistance programs, community based organizations	

Resources:		Target Audience: Low income, eligible community members.	
Key Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">A. Assess the current needs of the population.B. Conduct outreach and education to enroll families and priority populations to increase participation in WIC and SNAP.C. Seek opportunities to adequately fund existing systems.D. Implement innovative strategies to increase participation and funding (check box for funding).E. Convene partners to discuss solutions for improved access.			
Strategy 9: Identify and implement strategies with the retail sector to promote and incent fruit and vegetable purchases for priority populations.			
Rationale/Potential Impact: There are many ways to increase access to healthy foods in a community. Most of us purchase our food from retail stores including supermarkets, grocery stores, co-ops, corner stores, and convenience stores. Through partnerships and policies with the retail sector, we can improve how healthy food is promoted, priced, and placed for improved consumer access. This strategy also explores opportunities for providing incentives to SNAP participants to purchase fruits and vegetables.			
Lead Organization: PHSKC, City of Seattle	Priority: Medium	Type: Current & Scalable	Related Strategies: FA 3, 7
Measurement: Population level health outcomes, program specific evaluation, implementation of incentive programs and redemption rates.		Key Partners: Retailers, distributors, WIC and SNAP recipients, DOH, community based organizations	
Resources: Some existing funds through PHSKC SNAP-Ed grant, CDC funds. State Department of Health will submit a USDA grant in partnership with City of Seattle to enhance and grow this work.		Target Audience: SNAP, WIC recipients. Low income community members.	
Key Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">A. Coordinate with retailers (grocery, co-ops, corner stores) to ensure availability of fruits and vegetables, develop incentive and promotion strategies for low income (SNAP, WIC) consumers to purchase fruits and vegetables (with emphasis on local).B. Provide technical assistance and support to retailers to implement strategies (coupons, fruit and vegetable bundles, incentives).C. Pursue and identify policy solutions to ensure that the majority of food available through retail outlets is healthy, local, and affordable.			
Strategy 10: Coordinate with the health care sector to implement innovative programs, practices, and policies to increase fruit and vegetable consumption in priority populations.			
Rationale/Potential Impact: The health care sector is uniquely qualified to promote access to healthy, affordable foods. Many King County hospitals are identifying strategies to increase healthy options for patients, visitors, and staff and this strategy aims to explore other opportunities including healthy food prescription models and health plan incentives. Medical providers carry a certain weight in many communities and their recommendation along with a direct suggested action can have an important impact on changing behavior.			
Lead Organization: PHSKC	Priority: Medium	Type: Current &	Related Strategies: FA 1, 3, 13

		Scalable	
Measurement: Overall population measures, Community Health Needs Assessment, program specific evaluation.		Key Partners: Hospitals, community based organizations, community members, farmers, food banks, community health clinics/FQHCs	
Resources: PHSKC has some funds to convene a community benefit group and healthy hospital work group. Funds are needed to enhance this effort.		Target Audience: Hospital patients and staff, health plan members, the community at large.	
Key Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">A. Engage hospitals in supporting increased fruit and vegetable consumption through community benefit programsB. Coordinate with hospitals, providers, and health plans to provide “prescriptions” and other access points for fruits and vegetables for low income priority populations.C. Implement food banks, good food bags, or CSA drop sites at hospitals or other health care hubs.			
Strategy 11: Increase the number of healthy food procurement policies (with emphasis on fruits and vegetables) in large gathering places (community centers, worksites, recreation/cultural settings), with an emphasis on priority populations			
Rationale/Potential Impact: Food consumption across the US and in King County has increased over time and obesity rates are on the rise. In many places where we shop, play, and worship, it is difficult to find healthy, affordable food options. Procurement policies can support improvement in the healthfulness of the food supply and decrease intake of nutrients of concern.			
Lead Organization: PHSKC	Priority: Medium	Type: Current & Scalable	Related Strategies: FA 1, 4, 7
Measurement: Number of new policies, population level data, feedback from consumers.		Key Partners: Recreational/cultural sites, community based organizations, COPC	
Resources: PHSKC has very limited funds to work on this. Additional funds are needed to continue this work.		Target Audience: Consumers and staff in these settings.	
Key Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">A. Approach large gathering places to determine interest in offering healthier food options, share best practices from other communities, and identify strategies for implementation.B. Provide technical assistance, training and support to sites as they implement policies.C. Recognize and promote successful policies and other success stories.			
Strategy 12: Continue and build on conversations with diverse stakeholders and communities to learn about barriers, solutions, and collaboration opportunities for increasing fruit and vegetable consumption and food security in priority communities, to build capacity among communities to implement change.			
Rationale/Potential Impact: Success of each of these strategies depends on the effort invested in bringing people together, building and nurturing relationships, and collaboratively implementing community change. While many efforts in King County have led us to understand that there are significant barriers to healthy eating, we must continue those conversations as this plan progresses, recognizing that community-			

driven strategies are more effective in leading to meaningful change for those we're aiming to reach.			
Lead Organization: PHSKC	Priority: Medium	Type: Current & Scalable	Related Strategies: All FA Strategies
Measurement: Number of community members participating, documentation of feedback, input, and solutions.		Key Partners: Community members, community organizations, local coalitions, retailers	
Resources: PHSKC has some funds between 2015 and 2017 to work on this in South King County.		Target Audience: Community members	
Key Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">A. Conduct "listening sessions", attend coalition meetings, and identify other opportunities to listen to and learn from community membersB. Provide support and capacity building opportunities to communities on community change processes and leadership.			
Strategy 13: Increase access to direct market outlets for priority communities including local Community Supported Agriculture programs (CSA), farmers markets, farm stands, mobile markets.			
Rationale/Potential Impact: Direct market outlets are good for the local food economy and for the people they reach. This strategy aims to better understand the distribution of direct market outlets (farmers markets, CSAs, farm stands) and to work with farmers and organizations to pilot programs to provide increased access for low income community members.			
Lead Organization: PHSKC	Priority: Medium	Type: New	Related Strategies: FA 3,4,8,10
Measurement: Number of direct market access points in low income or high need communities, use of markets by community members.		Key Partners: WSFMA, farmers, Seattle Tilth, City of Seattle, NABC, Schools, Child care settings	
Resources:		Target Audience: High need communities, priority populations	
Key Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">A. Identify (create a map of) food access points where priority populations purchase food and work with those locations to accept EBT/SNAP (CSA's, good food bags)B. Through Action A, identify gaps and places where direct access points do not currently exist.C. Coordinate with farmers and others to pilot new access points and payment options that meet the needs of community members.D. Fund and support innovative models.			
Strategy 14: Implement a universal school meal program with at least one King County school district with high free/reduced lunch participation.			
Rationale/Potential Impact: Federally funded school meals greatly lessens the financial burden on low income families and significantly increases their children's intake of nutritious food – but only if schools participate. A universal meal program has the potential to eliminate paperwork for schools, provide better nutrition for students, eliminate stigma associated with free/reduced lunch systems, and could also be an			

economic stimulus. This strategy aims to subsidize school meals through local policy.			
Lead Organization: PHSKC	Priority: Medium	Type: New	Related Strategies: FA 1,2,6
Measurement: HYS data, evaluation from pilot school/district.		Key Partners: School district, students, parents, community organizations	
Resources:		Target Audience: School age children	
Key Actions:			
Strategy 15: Convene partners to better understand how poverty, inequities, and other costs lead to food insecurity.			
Rationale/Potential Impact: Food insecurity, hunger, obesity, and inequitable access to healthy, affordable food are complex problems. We recognize that poverty and structural inequities are leading drivers and that rising income inequality, high costs of housing, transportation and medical care, and a regressive tax structure are all leading drivers of poverty. This strategy aims to better understand these connections to healthy eating and implement innovative solutions.			
Lead Organization: University of Washington/PHSKC	Priority: Medium overall, but high on evaluating food security impacts	Type: New	Related Strategies: FA 4, 18
Measurement: Evaluation of policies, impact on healthy eating		Key Partners: City of Seattle, City of SeaTac, businesses, PHSKC, community organizations	
Resources:		Target Audience: Community members and employees	
Key Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">A. Convene partners to discuss and identify barriers and solutionsB. Coordinate with the Cities of SeaTac and Seattle to evaluate the health impacts of minimum wage policies, including impact on healthy eating and food securityC. Implement innovative solutions			
Strategy 16: Create a feebate program to correct for market distortions and externalities.			
Rationale/Potential Impact: A feebate program is a self-financed system of fees and rebates (historically used in the transportation and energy sectors) that influence purchase decisions by increasing cost of undesirable/unhealthy products while lowering costs of desirable/healthy products. This mechanism could be applied to food products at varying scales and via several food access pathways, including grocery delivery, in-store grocery purchase, and/or via prepared food channels, especially institutions. Preliminary and developmental steps include convening collaborators, establishing scope and criteria for fees and rebates, creating mechanisms for price adjustments, and system evaluation and adaptive management processes. Feebate programs can correct for market distortions and externalities that today send food price signals to consumers with negative health, environmental and economic consequences. The extent of the corrective effect of this program will hinge on the reach, extent and intensity of the program. A more impactful program would include more retailers/institutions, have more pronounced			

fees/rebates, and cover a broader array of foods.			
Lead Organization:	Priority: Medium	Type: New	Related Strategies:
Measurement:		Key Partners:	
Resources:		Target Audience:	
Key Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">A. Convene a cross-sector (public, private, civic, academic) collaboration to design a regionally-scaled feebate program that promotes healthy food choices through price signals.B. Engage collaborators to establish criteria for healthy/unhealthy food types, create fee and rebate pricing standardsC. Pilot and evaluate			
Strategy 17: Implement educational activities and campaigns to empower communities and increase consumption of fruits and vegetables, with a focus on priority populations and communities.			
Rationale/Potential Impact: Health and nutrition education are important components to increasing healthy, affordable food access. Community members must know what the resources and programs are in order to access them, and it is also important to address other individual barriers to healthy eating including cooking classes, shopping tips, and eating well on a budget. There is a significant amount of work happening in King County to increase nutrition education, and much to do to coordinate and enhance existing activities.			
Lead Organization: PHSKC	Priority: Low	Type: Current & Scalable	Related Strategies: All FA Strategies
Measurement: Population level health data, evaluation of individual programs.		Key Partners: SNAP-Ed providers, nutrition education groups, Seattle Tilth, Solid Ground, WSU Extension, FEEST	
Resources: SNAP-Ed recipients have some funds dedicated to specific projects around increasing nutrition education for SNAP recipients. There are many organizations across the county doing this work. Additional funds are needed to enhance and engage community members in this process.		Target Audience: SNAP, WIC recipients. Other low income community members.	
Key Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">A. Work with communities to develop educational activitiesB. Promote existing programs, initiatives and resources among community members to facilitate healthy, affordable food access.C. Provide nutrition education, skill building, and other educational opportunities for priority populations, youth, children in schools, and the community.D. Implement the FEEST program, or similar models, in all schools in King County			
Strategy 18: Engage diverse stakeholders and communities to learn about barriers and collaboration opportunities for improving how hunting, foraging, and fishing can increase healthy food security.			

Rationale/Potential Impact: Hunting, fishing, and foraging are opportunities for all community members to access healthy, local food sources. At this time, there is little known locally about the barriers or use of these mechanisms, especially among low income community members. This strategy will help us to better understand the community needs and any solutions to improve access.			
Lead Organization: King County	Priority: Low	Type: New	Related Strategies: FA 4, 18
Measurement:		Key Partners: Department of Fish and Wildlife, Cities, community members, community organizations, other relevant government agencies	
Resources:		Target Audience: Community members interested in using these food access pathways to eat healthy.	
Key Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">A. Convene stakeholders, partners, and government agencies to understand barriers, opportunities, solutions.B. Review current processes, policies, and procedures for hunting, fishing, and foraging.			
Strategy 19: Increase the number of community and school gardens and other garden opportunities available in priority communities.			
Rationale/Potential Impact: Community, school, and other gardens have potential for educating community members about where food comes from, fostering community ownership and stewardship among community members, bringing people together, and building community leaders. They also build resiliency and provide opportunities for new immigrants to produce traditional crops that are otherwise unavailable locally, provide exposure to cultural traditions, and serve as access points for meeting new people.			
Lead Organization:	Priority: Low	Type: Current	Related Strategies: FA 2,4,19
Measurement: Number of gardens, map of community and school gardens.		Key Partners: Cities, city planners, PSRC, community members, community organizations, housing organizations	
Resources:		Target Audience: Community members.	
Key Actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none">A. Create/expand gardens in places such as housing authorities, low income housing communities, schoolsB. Coordinate with community organizations to implement community gardens and other urban agriculture, work to secure resources as needed.			